

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/026,836	BEDINGFIELD, JAMES C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan Ouellette	3629	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jonathan Ouellette.

(3) Poh C. Chua.

(2) John Weiss.

(4) Christian Momtfort.

Date of Interview: _____.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Independent Claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: Vass and CellPoint.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Chua and Ms. Momtfort discussed the basics of the claimed invention and the perceived differences in the prior art; to include: the prior art does not teach how (enablement) the system operates, simply that it would work a certain way (method/process). Mr. Weiss (SPE) discussed that non functional subject matter would not distinguish the invention over the prior art. Mr. Chua further discussed that the two subsets of information provided in the claimed system: (1) providing distance information to the user and (2) not providing distance information to the user - aligned with the establishment information, was not clearly shown in the prior art. Mr. Ouellette and Mr. Weiss discussed that such an element would have been obvious to include with the prior art - as it would provide not distinct advantage - and furthermore, such data would be non-functional to the claimed system..